

CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY

COUNCIL OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE

Minutes of the meeting held on Friday, March 7, 1986

PRESENT: C. Bertrand, Chairperson; P. Kenniff, Rector; C. Foster; J. Princz; D. Dicks; G. Valaskakis; P. Albert; F. Shlosser; T. Arbuckle-Maag; M. Barlow; A. Broes; D. Brown; W. Byers; A. Costanzo; R. Cronin, s.j.; L. Crysler; J. Doyle; W. Gilsdorf; K. Herrmann; R. Hooper; W. Knitter; J. Locke; D. Markiewicz; D. McDougall; H. McQueen; J. Ryan; S. Mullett; G. Newsham; M. Oppenheim; R. Pallen; B. Petrie; S. Sahni; D. Shapiro; H. Shulman; L. Van Toch; K. Waters; H. Breslow; M. Buffone; D. Goldsmith; K. Goral; L. Gray; D. Konig; M. Lange; Y. Lifshitz; D. Lindsay; S. Van Breevort; N. Wallace; L. Lapostolle; G. Decarie (representing History).

ABSENT WITH REGRETS: W. Sellers; N. Dhouhy; J. Stosik; J. Hill.

1. Call to Order

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

2. Approval of Agenda

86-2-1 It was moved and seconded (Petrie/Pallen) to approve the agenda.

Attention was drawn to the fact that the committee referred to in item 7a was approved as an ad hoc committee.

The agenda as amended was approved.

3. Remarks by the Rector

Rector Kenniff indicated that he was grateful for the opportunity to meet with the members of Council and by way of introduction with respect to some of the areas of concern that he has in the University, he said that it is his hope to institute such meetings with all the Faculty Councils and other constituencies in the University on a regular ongoing basis.

He said that among the major recent developments in the University, one has been the approval of a reform package for the University Senate. He elaborated on the process through which that was achieved and paid particular tribute to those members of the Steering Committee of Senate who worked assiduously and selflessly on the project and said that it was a remarkable collective effort in trying to come to grips with the mission

of Senate and its workings as the supreme academic decision-making body in the University.

Dr. Kenniff said that he, personally, was extremely enthusiastic about the result of the exercise because the structure would provide opportunities for dedicated people to become involved and to do something about the future development of the University.

He outlined two advantages of the new committee structure; the Academic Planning and Priorities Committee, which can, working with Faculty Councils, develop proposals for the ongoing objectives and priorities of the University and the attempt to link the working of the Senate committees and, therefore, Senate generally, more closely with the kind of academic planning that purports goes on in Faculty Councils, by having the Academic Deans sitting ex-officio on most of the Senate committees thereby being able to provide meaningful input into the workings of Senate.

On the subject that many people expressed concerns about, the idea of having Senate, as a University body taking any interest whatsoever in planning, he said that he would find it difficult for the University to make any choices about its future development particularly when choices have to be made about new orientations for development, if the process of thinking through, at a very fundamental level, of what is considered to be the objectives as an academic institution, and of what are to be the institution's priorities had not been gone through. The Rector gave some examples for the need of having a five-year strategic plan.

The Rector's second point had to do with the question of the budget situation in the University. He said that last year the Board of Governors gave him the mandate of attempting in a single year to submit a balanced budget, but his feeling and that of the Vice-Rectors was that such a proposal would have been a major blow to the vitality, even to the existence of the University so that the budget that was passed, while lean in its expenditures, still provided for a deficit which will be in the order of ten million dollars, and which over three years will be reduced to three million dollars, an amount slightly under the interest charges for the cumulative debt.

Dr. Kenniff indicated the exercise of bringing revenues and expenditures closer into line until they meet is one that involves acting on the expenditure side as has happened in the past few years. On the revenue side the University has been putting the case to the government, in a very forceful way in the past year, that Concordia's chronic continuing structural

situation of underfunding must be corrected. He commented on the efforts of faculty, students, and staff who, during the last election campaign, were out on the huskings talking to the candidates on the cause of higher education in general and the cause of Concordia University in particular. He said that that remarkable exercise in collective will must continue because although the Minister of Higher Education is sympathetic to the cause, it is a case that is not going to be won easily when the government's own deficit is in a runaway situation.

Dr. Kenniff stated that the University's argument with the government is not only one of maintaining the status quo with respect to last year, but for a correction to the traditional inequitable funding formula and a recognition of its status as an underfunded university with respect to sister institutions. In addition, it is exploring the possibility of making some arrangements with respect to the cumulative deficit which could ease the interest charges on the operating budget and be a considerable step in balancing the budget without harming anyone in the institution.

With regard to what the government is proposing on tuition fees, the Rector said that the University is not likely to be very favourable to an increase, particularly if the net result was no improvement to the bursary and loan program and no net gain to the universities whatsoever. He said that he had the impression that the government sees tuition fees as a source of revenue for the government and certainly not as a source of revenue for the universities.

Concerning the recent budget exercise, the Rector said that some people wonder if they are bureaucratic exercises in trying to balance figures on pieces of paper. He said that was part of it, but certainly not the main thrust within the University. His own view is that the future academic development of the University cannot take place unless its finances are in a reasonably healthy situation and the exercise of trying, both on the revenue side and the expenditure side, to bring the budget into a form of balance, has as its primary objective to be able to secure its financial position which in turn will enable the University to engage in the kind of development activities that are necessary for the future development of the University and as part of the overall development of universities in the province also.

He expressed the point of view that universities are a vital element of the economic policy of a country because it is only through well trained, well educated university graduates that a country such as Canada can hope to compete in the international sphere with other countries that are doing much greater things in the field of higher education, and that the spending on higher education is really a question of a will of a particular society to invest, not only in the economic dimension but also in the cultural and social aspects. However, when selling people in the business community about the value of the university, it is a lot easier to sell from an economic prospective.

With respect to the major aspect of the budget, that is the capital budget, Dr. Kenniff commented on the building program. He explained how over the past year the University had succeeded in securing some zoning changes which will enable construction of the Vanier Library extension to begin. By changing the original plan which was to extend the building to five stories to a three-story extension and to build the same floor space over a wider area, the City of Montreal changed the by-law in October 1985. The Rector said that the funding is committed by the Quebec government, the capital campaign portion of the money is available and there is nothing to stop the University from proceeding to the next step of getting detailed drawings, calling for tenders, and beginning to build.

Dr. Kenniff explained that expansion of the downtown campus is more complicated for a number of reasons. Concerning the subject of litigation by the tenants of the Royal George Apartments, Dr. Kenniff said that he did not expect to get a decision from the Court of Appeal before eight to ten months, but in the meantime, had instructed the lawyers to make a preliminary motion to dismiss the appeal on the grounds that it was frivolous as a last recourse. He reported recently he received the delightfully good news that the Court of Appeal accepted the motion.

The members of Council were given the information that the change in design to the downtown building came about for a number of reasons, the two main ones being: a) that the government was not prepared to authorize the University to build 26,000 square meters of space on the basis of their projections on enrolment figures for the year 2001; b) the government was not prepared to authorize a lease-back arrangement under any circumstances. What the government was prepared to authorize initially was quite a bit less than that, but finally the figure reached in the Fall was 7,500 nsm, which added to the already authorized 13,400 nsm for the downtown library brought the figure to 20,975 nsm.

Contrary to some reports which said that the library will be smaller, Dr. Kenniff assured the members of Council that the library space is exactly the same library space as planned from the beginning, but that the building will be smaller by approximately 5,000 nsm. The Rector noted that indeed the 7485 nsm of additional space is still to be proved in the next five-year plan but that the Ministry has authorized us to go ahead with the plan and do architects drawings on the basis of that figure. However the result of these changes is to call into question, quite severely, the original design concept and the architects have been asked to submit a new design concept into which the 20,975 nsm will go. In order to make sure that the

building will be incorporated into its urban environment and relate to other University buildings with harmonious results, an architectural committee has been formed to advise the University on the design concept.

Dr. Kenniff noted that the allocation of the space inside the building is basically for the University to decide and to this end, the task force of the Planning Committee, last May, circulated a questionnaire to all department and unit heads asking a series of seven questions about their future plans, desires to be in proximity to the library, in proximity to other departments as well, etc. On the basis of the responses received, a proposal was submitted to the architects and once a design concept has been received for the some 10,000 nsm of non-library space, they will be sent to unit heads and department heads for reaction. Dr. Kenniff said that he hoped that by this summer we would have not only a design concept but also have a working proposal with respect to the allocation of space which the architects can then translate into working drawings. He said that there has been a tremendous amount of progress over the past eight months with respect to the building projects both in terms of having government funds finally committed and of some progress being made in terms of the capital campaign.

In terms of the actual solution of technical problems that have to be decided prior to building, many are in the process of being solved and the day is very close when we will be breaking ground, and starting to build. However, he said he could not be complacent about a couple of things. First, the technical problems and costs involved in shoring up the facade of the Royal George Apartment while construction takes place. Secondly, with regard to the capital campaign, because of dozens of public institutions across Canada that are soliciting corporate dollars for different and varied worthwhile projects. A reassessment has been done of the capital campaign to this point and plans made for a second phase for gearing up to a final push for funds both inside and outside the University.

He concluded his remarks by saying that he hoped that eighteen months from next September, we will be able to say mission accomplished and the campaign has met its objective.

Members of Council were invited to ask questions.

It was asked if there was some capacity for upward expansion of the Vanier building and it was wondered if, as was stated in the initial dialogue, departments in the Centennial building would be moved into the new complex.

The Rector replied that there are concerns there because of neighbourhood concerns that were expressed and there are constraints in building, but whether the solution, in the future, is to expand upwards or in some other way it is not a problem to provide for upward expansion and the architects are looking at that at the moment. However, that would only apply to the new construction.

With respect to the Centennial building he said that there has been no final decision made with regard to the allocation of non-library space because of the changes in design that have taken place, but he assured the members of Council that he was fully aware of the problems with the building and he outlined one or two possible solutions.

On the question of a cost of living payment that the faculty expected in January as part of the collective agreement the Rector said that while the matter was the responsibility of the Vice-Rector for Institutional Relations he could say that the collective agreement provided for an increase on the basis of the government salary policy, that was not known then and, in fact, is not completely known now, but as soon as the money is available it will be paid.

Concern was expressed by one member of the fact that the questionnaire to which the Rector had referred earlier had not been seen by many faculty members and it was suggested that some people might like to know what the plan is so that they could have the chance to respond at least as individuals.

Dr. Kenniff replied that in one Faculty it was decided that the Dean would do it centrally, in others individual departments responded, and in some cases there were no responses, but by and large two-thirds to three-quarters of those who had the questionnaire replied. He assured the member that there would be ample time and ample opportunity for interested individuals to respond to the plan.

One student stated that there is more need for non-library space on the downtown campus and if there are to be changes because of budget constraints, then the space should be sacrificed on the westend campus in order to provide it downtown.

Dr. Kenniff replied that the reason the size of the building downtown was reduced is not a question of budget constraints. Exactly the same norm for each square meter applies to the new building as applied to the old, but the first plan was for a building of 26,000 nsm of space which corresponded exactly to the rental space that the University had downtown. The problem is that the government did not approve a building of that size. The Rector said that he wanted to make it understood that this does not reduce the amount of space the university occupies, it merely means that the 5,000 nsm we are not allowed to build on that property will continue to be housed in rental premises somewhere in downtown Montreal. It might be that the Faculty of Commerce and Administration will remain in the Guy Metro building if it is considered to be the best space in proximity to the owned property, especially if it ends up linked to the Metro Station and the rest of the University by tunnel.

Two letters which appeared in the Thursday Report, one concerning the possibility of a double standard for upper levels of Administration, and the other concerning cost efficiency studies were mentioned and the Rector was asked to comment on their contents.

Dr. Kenniff stated that there is no double standard in the University and that that is absolutely clear. With respect to the existence of luxurious cars he said that the Rector and Vice-Rectors have always had a car allowance as part of their conditions of employment. In his particular case it is a car allowance and, contrary to most of his colleagues in the province, he drives the car himself. He said that last year a lot of people became concerned when it was felt that every unit of the University would be rolled back 5-7% in terms of overall budget; in point of fact the academic units were even increased and that was a decision consciously made, no one was asked to make any sort of "sacrifice" by way of salary reduction or real cuts in spending. The Rector reiterated the point that there is no double standard and that as long as he is in the job there will not be any. On the question of what the budget will look like in the future he said every effort will be made to have the administration to be just as lean, if not leaner, than it expects the faculty to be and will try to make sure that being lean does not mean being mean.

With regard to the second letter Dr. Kenniff said that he can understand the concern but there is no attempt to single out any particular unit. If we are going to make gains in the present system in terms of the administration of the budget choices have to be made, gains in productivity, cuts in activities, slashes on the academic side and non-academic side, but it would seem that if it is established that in certain areas there is a possibility, without affecting personnel, to make productivity gains then attempts should be made to do so. That is being done in two service areas through expert advice and if the study of those units, which are considered

to be pilot projects, prove to be successful there is no reason why others should not be studied.

It was noted that some service units again and again seem to be cutting back and putting the burden of paying for things that they used to pay for on to department budgets. It was said that that sort of thing puts a lot of pressure on Arts and Science.

The Rector agreed that it is absolutely useless and zero sum gain to the University to make savings in one area that are passed on to another. He said that the administration is as sensitive as possible to that type of thing but that one of the difficulties has been the refinement of the budget monitoring processes as it existed, and it is something that is going to take some little time to correct. He said that what they may be asking a unit on the service side to do is to charge, if it is going to charge, on the basis of the real cost of what it is doing and what that may reveal is that it might be cheaper to do certain of those services under contract with outside people than it is to do it with people inside by having a full-blown permanent service for doing them. He said that he is not planning any figures on that or drawing any conclusions, but it is a legitimate question to ask.

One member expressed disappointment because the Rector had not made a few personhood statements about the role of Arts and Science in the University. He said that two particular matters make him wonder about that role. He noted that in the reorganization of Senate, not only did the number of Arts and Science representatives drop, but much worse, the suggestion by the Dean that a few Vice-Deans might also be part of Senate was completely thrown out. Secondly, he noted that in the Rectors presentation of how he argues with the people outside the University the argument often has to be put in terms of economic utility and it is always going to be easier to argue for the economic utility of Commerce or Engineering than it is for Arts and Science. He said that he was afraid that if the Rector was not aware of how much the Arts and Science Faculty is concerned about its resources that it might get caught up in the economic utility argument and not be given its due.

The Rector reminded the member that he had visited the Faculty Council last year at which time submissions related to the reorganization of Arts and Science were discussed. As well two questions that were asked by the member were discussed at length concerning the role of Arts and Science in the University. Dr. Kenniff said that when he referred to economic utility he was referring to the University as a whole and not any particular aspect of it. He said that the greatest concerns he hears from the business community relate to the quality of general education and he mentioned the article

that appeared in the Globe and Mail recently in which it was said that employers are now looking to graduates with a general education and broad grounding in different humanist disciplines and the ability to think critically. He also referred to the statement by the President of Northern Telecom testifying in the Senate Committee on Finance on the subject of universities and his reference to the need to change engineering curricula to better reflect the need for good general grounding among engineers rather than highly specialized and highly technical training.

In answer to a question about the need to reduce the size of the library building if additional funds are not raised through the capital campaign the Rector said that he did not think that there was any real problem with respect to the funds for construction of the library project, but the University set an objective of twenty-five million dollars for a lot of needs that are to a certain extent just as vital as the library and were considered a rock bottom list of needs for a university which has had the raw end of the stick for a long time. He said that it is the first time the University has gone to the community for funds and he hoped it would not be the last, but in order to have a second time and a potentially successful second time, you have to succeed in the first.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved and seconded (Sahni/Valaskakis) to approve the minutes of the meeting held on Friday, February 7, 1986.

Prof. Brown indicated that he had attended the February meeting but his name was not listed with those who were present.

The minutes as amended were approved and adopted.

5. CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

Dean Bertrand reported that he had been unsuccessful in his attempts to speak to Sam Black in the past week and that he wished to announce in Council that at any point the Faculty decides, for whatever reason, that there will be student fees beyond those of the normal tuition fees every effort will be made to consult with the students involved, as happened in the Co-Op case, and try to give as much notice as possible about the fees that are going to be implemented, and if at all possible, have input from the students.

The Dean said that he had a copy of the statement the Rector had referred to, and which he too had intended to mention, and if anyone wanted to look at it they should let him know. He said that it was an impressive speech coming from somebody

one would normally think would not be in favour of Arts and Science. The problem with the statement he said was that presidents and vice-presidents of corporations are always telling newspapers, etc. that they really want Arts graduates, but the personnel at the level of hiring are not informed and continue to hire commerce graduates, therefore he thought it important to keep trying to get the message across at that level.

Dean Bertrand reported that it is quite clear that the closing of a department or the closing of a programme is an academic matter and as such would come before Faculty Council for its consideration and recommendation on the wisdom of the proposal.

6. QUESTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Prof. Brown withdrew the notice of motion which he had distributed at the beginning of the meeting in view of the announcement made by the Dean. He said that he had prepared the motion because of the uncertainty of the part Council would play in the dissolution of a department or programme when it was discussed at the last meeting.

Prof. Decarie asked for assurance that his report on the future of Canadian Studies, which he had prepared for the Dean of Arts Office, some time ago, would come before Council no later than the next meeting. Vice-Dean Dicks replied that there has been some internal discussion, particularly relating to resource implications, and that it might be best to have the Curriculum Committee look at the matter before bringing it to Council.

Referring to the policy concerning the retraction of overall members of faculty by attrition it was asked when there might be an easing of its application with regard to group four. The Dean replied that he was not aware of such a document, but one of the things he and the Vice-Deans planned to do was to prepare a document on priorities and that was why Chairs and Principals of Colleges had been asked to submit an academic priorities statement. He hoped that that could be ready relatively soon and that it will be possible to bring in some new people with fresh ideas through the skilled application of limited-term appointments, at least in the first instance.

Vice-Dean Valaskakis announced that in terms of her mandate of academic planning she has an advisory committee which as one of its most important areas is concerned with faculty development. She said the committee has been meeting on the issue and will have a proposal for the Dean and Vice-

Deans to consider in terms of this area including the appointment of new faculty and what is happening to continuing faculty.

It was said that one of the ways to acquire new ideas is to attend conferences, but the budget does not facilitate that practice easily.

Vice-Dean Valaskakis replied that while it is true that the budget is smaller in this area, mainly through loss of CASA grants, in general nobody has been refused who fits into the category of giving a paper at a conference, but there are not sufficient funds to allow people to attend a second conference.

During a discussion resulting from a question concerning the use of Bel-Air Travel services, Vice-Dean Albert said that he had inquired about the matter at the request of some faculty who hold research grants and the reply he received was that it was not the intent to force everybody to use Bel-Air's services, however, it was felt that if there is an agreement with the company to get cheaper rates it is there for the researchers to use, and if there are cheaper rates available elsewhere they would like to know about it because it would mean Bel-Air is not giving the rates it promised it would.

7. ELECTIONS

a) Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women for the Faculty of Arts and Science

Dean Bertrand announced that CUNASA had appointed Ms. Lila Dhanani as its representative on the Ad Hoc Committee for the Status of Women for the Faculty, and that the Part-time Faculty Association had chosen Martha Saunders as its representative.

It was announced that the undergraduate student representatives would be John Scott and Johanna Stosik, and that the graduate student representative would be Lynn Lapostolle.

Dean Bertrand said that he would represent the Dean of Arts Office.

The Dean reported that the Steering Committee had received six nominations for the three full-time faculty positions: Profs. W. Gilsdorf (Com. Studies), Mary Brian (Mathematics), A. Gollner (Political Science), F. Ligier (Et. Françaises), and M. Verthuy (Et. Françaises).

There were no nominations from the floor.

Separate ballots were held for each seat. Profs. Mary Brian, W. Gilsdorf, and S. Mullett were elected to the Committee.

b) Committee on General Education

Jim Locke was elected student representative to the Committee on General Education.

8. DEPARTMENT AWARDS IN THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCE - Undergraduate Calendar Entry (ASFC 86-2-D1)

Dean Bertrand reported that the proposed calendar statement for Department Awards (ASFC 86-2-D1) was the result of a discussion he and the Registrar had following a Senate meeting at which the Council's recommendation on changes in the criteria for the awarding of the Walter Raudorf Medal in Physics was referred back to Council for further study.

It was moved and seconded (Sahni/Pallen) to approve the general statement which will appear in the Undergraduate Calendar on Department Awards under section 17.3.

The Dean outlined the Steering Committee's suggestions for changes in the wording of the statement and following a general discussion it was agreed that editorial changes would be incorporated into the main motion as follows: a) to remove the word "most" from the first sentence; b) to re-word the third sentence to "The Departments or Units in making their selection may include, in addition to a high grade point average, other criteria such as number and/or level of the courses taken, outstanding results on a project or essay, or a significant contribution to the extra-curricular life of the department"; and c) to delete the last sentence.

Two changes to section 17.3.1 were agreed to: the second entry was changed to refer to the prize in Biology to reflect the change in the name of the Department from Biological Sciences; the phrase "for Women's Studies" was added to the last entry on the page.

Vote: Carried

9. DIPLOMA IN THE TEACHING OF MATHEMATICS) (ASFC 86-2-D3, uncirculated)

At the Council meeting of December 6, 1986, a proposal to revise the Diploma in the Teaching of Mathematics was accepted in principle, subject to a formal agreement being reached between the Mathematics Department and Education on certain outstanding issues. Vice-Dean Dicks reported that such an agreement had been reached and he submitted a letter he had

written to Dean Bertrand which was signed by the Chairman of the Departments concerned as well as the programme directors and himself, outlining the details of the agreement. He asked that the statement be entered into the record.

10. OTHER BUSINESS

No other business was raised.

11. NEXT MEETING

The Dean reported that the next meeting was tentatively set for April 4, 1986.

12. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 3:40 p.m. (Pallen/Sahni).